```
IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE STATE OF OREGON
 2
                     FOR THE COUNTY OF MULTNOMAH
 3
     THE ESTATE OF MICHELLE
    SCHWARZ, deceased, by and
     through her Personal
     Representative, RICHARD
     SCHWARZ,
 7
                    Plaintiff, ) Circuit Court
                                     Case No. 0002-01376
              VS.
9
     PHILIP MORRIS INCORPORATED,
10
     a foreign corporation, and
                                   )
     ROTHS I.G.A. FOODLINER,
    INCORPORATED, an Oregon
11
     corporation,
12
                   Defendants.
                                  )
13
14
                      TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
15
                             Volume 46-B
16
17
                         BE IT REMEMBERED, That the
    above-entitled matter came on regularly for Jury Trial
18
    and was heard before the Honorable Roosevelt Robinson,
19
20
     Judge of the Circuit Court of the County of Multnomah,
21
     State of Oregon, commencing at 11:00 a.m., Friday,
22
    March 15, 2002.
23
24
25
1
    APPEARANCES:
          Mr. D. Lawrence Wobbrock, Attorney at Law,
          Mr. Charles S. Tauman, Attorney at Law,
          Mr. Richard A. Lane, Attorney at Law,
 4
             Appearing on behalf of the Plaintiff;
 5
 6
          Mr. James L. Dumas, Attorney at Law,
          Mr. John W. Phillips, Attorney at Law,
 7
             Appearing on behalf of Defendant
             Philip Morris, Incorporated and Defendant
8
             Roths I.G.A. Foodliner, Incorporated.
9
10
    ALSO PRESENT:
         Mr. Herbert Pallant
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

25

```
1
                                 INDEX
 2
                                                     Page
 3
      Defendant's Closing Statement
           By Mr. Dumas.....4
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
2.3
24
25
                                                             4
 1
                            MORNING SESSION
 2
                         Friday, March 15, 2002
 3
                               11:00 a.m.
 4
 5
             (Jennifer Wiles reported the initial session)
 6
 7
                      (Court was reconvened at 11:00 a.m.)
 8
 9
                THE COURT: Bring the jury, please.
10
                   (Jury entered the courtroom at 11:00 a.m.)
11
                THE COURT: All right.
12
                Counsel for the defense, you may proceed with your
13
           closing.
14
                MR. DUMAS: Thank you very much, Your Honor.
                May it please the Court, counsel, ladies and
15
16
           gentlemen of the jury.
                Mr. Wobbrock is right, certainly about one thing,
17
18
           and that is your job: The most difficult part of your
19
           job is about to begin.
20
                My comments for the next approximately hour and a
21
           half, I hope, will be for the most part limited to
22
           Michelle Schwarz because, fundamentally, this case, I
23
           believe, is mostly about Michelle Schwarz.
24
                Mr. Phillips, when I'm done, will be talking to
25
           you mostly about Philip Morris because in a case like
                                                             5
 1
           this, both parties -- both parties, Michelle Schwarz
 2
           and Philip Morris -- were aware of certain things, made
 3
           certain choices, made certain decisions, and have
 4
           certain responsibilities that come with those choices
 5
           and those decisions.
 6
                But this case is also, of course, about
 7
           cigarettes. Cigarettes are a very unique product.
 8
           Cigarettes are unlike any other consumer product in the
           world. And I think that fundamental fact illuminates
```

the distinction between Mr. Wobbrock's view of this case and mine.

You know, folks, when I go down to Les Schwab and buy a Firestone Tire and put that on my vehicle, my expectation, my understanding, my belief of how that product will perform is that it's not going to blow out when I go 70 miles an hour.

When I go down to Landmark Ford and buy a Ford Explorer and drive up to Mount Hood, my expectation, my belief as a reasonable consumer with experience about cars is that when I make a sudden turn, that SUV is not going to roll over. Where did I learn that? I learned it from life experiences.

Contrast that, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, with the cigarette. What is a reasonable person's expectations and understanding about what a cigarette

can do to you? Whether it's a full flavor cigarette, a medium flavor cigarette, a light cigarette, an ultra low-tar cigarette, our understanding, our expectation, our knowledge and our awareness of the inherent characteristics of that product is that if we use it, it can kill us.

Cigarettes are inherently dangerous, cigarettes are unavoidably dangerous. Why? Because burning tobacco, the smoke from burning tobacco, contains over 4,000 compounds, many of which are toxic and can cause cancer and other diseases. What makes a cigarette dangerous is not the humectants, what makes a cigarette dangerous is not the sugars, what makes a cigarette dangerous is not the additives, the one or 2 percent. What makes cigarettes dangerous is inhaling burning tobacco smoke, the smoke created from burning tobacco. And those cigarettes, when used as intended, can cause cancer and can shorten your life. And everybody knows that.

I commented upon that in opening statement. Everyone who came in this courtroom, before they heard anything from Mr. Wobbrock, before they heard anything from me, from any of the witnesses, knew that it's got a warning label right on it. It's got a warning label on it because our society has made a tough call, a

tough decision -- a right decision, a wrong decision, I don't know -- but a decision that cigarettes are legal and can be sold in this country with an appropriate warning written by Congress.

Mr. Wobbrock -- very, very skillful lawyer -- spent many hours criticizing Philip Morris' conduct. Why didn't Philip Morris do more to make a safe cigarette? They could have done this, they could have done that. Why didn't they do this?

Ladies and gentlemen, we also heard from Mr. Wobbrock that the cigarette business is very profitable. We heard billions of dollars, again and again and again. That the cigarette business is so profitable -- and, indeed, it is. But why is it that there is no safe cigarette anywhere in the world? There are hundreds of tobacco companies owned by countries -- some of them are owned by countries, Japan, other countries -- with all sorts of bright, intelligent people, scientists. Think of a market that might exist for a 100 percent safe cigarette. But no

one has been able to do it. And you know why? Because tobacco, when it burns, creates smoke that is dangerous. Period. The end. It's that fundamentally simple. You can't make it. Not yet, any way.

Mr. Wobbrock correctly pointed out that when you

1 2

folks go into the jury room with all the evidence, with all the exhibits, with the guidance of His Honor's instructions, you will be applying to that evidence, to those instructions, your life experiences. You will be applying to that evidence and to the law your common sense to reach a verdict, to reach a correct and a just verdict.

And let's talk a little bit about life experience. Our life experiences are that the risks of cigarette smoking are well-known and have been well-known for a long, long time. Our life experiences teach us that when people make a decision to smoke, they are making a voluntary decision. They are making a decision for themselves, for their own reasons. It may not be your reason, it may not be your neighbor's reason, it may not be your mother's reason, but it's your reason. And when you make a decision, our life experiences teach us that you're responsible for that decision.

When people smoke, they know it's bad for their health. Our life experiences teach us that. We are bombarded day in and day out from every source and direction imaginable with advertising. We filter those ads, we listen to the ads we want to listen to, and we ignore the ones that don't have any meaning to us.

We know from our life experiences that advertising

does not create our desire to do something. Ads don't control us or manipulate our decision making. Our life experiences teach us that we buy what we want to buy, and we leave on the shelf what we don't want to buy.

Our life experiences teach us that young people -young people can be over 18 and young people can be
under 18 -- but young people do try -- many young
people -- do try smoking cigarettes. Our experiences
teach us that that normally comes about because of
their friends, because of social situations, peer
pressure. Peers. That's what our common experiences
tell us.

Our common sense tells us that, then, that when we make a decision to smoke, it's an individual decision that we make. It's not the tobacco company's decision. Those cigarette packs are sitting there on the store shelf, whether it be Albertson's, whether it be Safeway, whether it be Ross IGA down in Salem or Fred Meyer. They're sitting there, and the customer makes the decision whether he or she wants to buy them.

All of us, most of us, have known people who have gotten sick from smoking cigarettes, whether they be family, friends, acquaintances. We all know from our life experiences that those people knew what they were doing when they smoked cigarettes. They knew smoking

wasn't good for them. They knew that it was up to them as individuals to make the decision of whether or not to smoke.

We know from our life experiences that a lot of young people try and experiment with things when they

move out of the family home, when they move out and they go away, and they're no longer under their parent's thumb. And they do things that they have been taught not to do. We know that as individuals growing up in this society. And we know that sometimes people smoke because a girlfriend smokes or their boyfriend smokes, and so they smoke. Social situations.

And we know from our life experiences that people do have the ability to quit smoking when they want to quit smoking. And we know from our life experiences that quitting smoking -- quitting drinking, whatever -- is not going to happen until that person reaches the point in their life when they're ready to do it, not when their wife is ready to do it, not when their husband is ready to do it, not when their mother is ready to do it, but when they are, individually, within themselves, because that's where it comes from.

We know a little bit about blame from growing up in this society. We know that people can assign blame. But we know in the context of a smoker who gets sick

from smoking a cigarette, and smoking cigarettes for years, that that blame really ought to come from that person themselves because they're the ones who know what they were doing, they're the ones who know why they made their choices. They're the ones who know why they chose to smoke and why they chose not to quit. Blame, I would submit, does not belong in someone else's hands. It belongs in the person who knows why they did what they did.

And we know that we, all of us, have grown up in a society where there are rules. And we know that those rules are in place so that all of us can make decisions with an expectation and an understanding whether or not those decisions fit within or without the rules. And we know that it wouldn't be fair and it wouldn't be right and it wouldn't be just to change the rules midstream and criticize someone for what they did 30 years ago when the rules were a little different.

During opening statement, I told you that all cigarettes can cause cancer. I told you that all cigarettes are addictive. I told you that all cigarettes are dangerous. And not one witness who came into this courtroom on behalf of Philip Morris said otherwise.

I mentioned in opening statement that this case is

about knowledge or awareness of the risks of smoking. This case is about freedom of choice to smoke or not to smoke. This case is about responsibility. And I want to talk about those three things to you to suggest how you might sift through the voluminous amounts -- voluminous amount of evidence in this case. But I don't want to talk about those things in the abstract. I don't want to preach. I want to talk about those things in relationship to Michelle Schwarz.

Now, in using the ray gun that Mr. Wobbrock finds offensive, and the green he finds offensive, this is something I showed you during opening statement: Knowledge, freedom, responsibility.

So this case is about Michelle Schwarz's choice to begin smoking, about her choice to smoke Merit cigarettes, about her choice not to quit until 1997;

and, ultimately, it's about responsibility for those decisions and those choices.

2.4

Now, we've heard the evidence. So what is the evidence about Michelle Schwarz? I believe the evidence in this case has demonstrated that Michelle Schwarz chose to start smoking with knowledge and awareness that cigarettes could be dangerous to her and could shorten her life. I think the evidence has shown that she chose to switch to Merit cigarettes, and we're

going to talk about the evidence as to why she made that decision.

She chose not to quit before 1997. Yes, there were some attempts, and we're going to talk about those. And I do believe -- and I guess this is where Mr. Wobbrock and I differ -- that Michelle Schwarz, as an intelligent, independent-thinking woman in this society, is responsible for her choices and decisions.

Now, Mr. Wobbrock doesn't like the word "choice" or "choose." He told you: Watch out. The defense lawyer is going to talk a whole bunch about "choice" and "choose". Be careful.

He doesn't like that word because it undermines his case. He knows that Michelle Schwarz made choices. And he tells us: Oh, come on. That wasn't a free choice that she made during 33 years of smoking. None of those were free choices because she was addicted.

Now, we're going to talk a lot about addiction later on. But consider this, consider this: If cigarette smoking was so addictive, if cigarette smoking robs each and every smoker of their free will, of their ability to understand what they're doing, if it deprives them of their ability to act freely, then how is it, why is it, how could it possibly be that over 50 million Americans, living Americans, have quit

smoking permanently. How is it? If cigarette smoking was that addictive, there wouldn't be any ex-smokers. Yet 50 million Americans have been able to beat the addiction of smoking.

And if being addicted means you are no longer responsible for your conduct or responsible for your choices or responsible for your decisions, why do we prosecute drug addicts, heroin users, who rob people? Why don't we just say: Oh, gosh, you robbed Mrs. Jones on the street there. But you're a heroin addict or meth addict or cocaine addict, and you're not responsible.

Now, Michelle Schwarz was not a heroin addict and she didn't rob anyone, but I want to make a point: People are responsible for their own actions, whether they smoke cigarettes, use alcohol or whatever.

We've heard an awful lot about youth smoking in this case, and I'm going to talk about that. I'm going to talk about it up front because God knows it's a hot button issue -- and it should be -- to every person in this courtroom. It should be a hot button issue. It should be the kind of issue that could turn any case, regardless of the facts, 180-degrees because all of us have a responsibility to our children, our own children, and all the children in this society.

But, you know, ladies and gentlemen, a fundamental

fact that Mr. Wobbrock has not talked to you about is that Michelle Schwarz was not a child when she started smoking. Michelle Schwarz -- Michelle Chuck -- was an 18 year old young woman who had moved away from home, going to nursing school when she chose to smoke. She's not a kid.

1 2

Now, for those of us who have 18 year old daughters, that's sometimes hard to swallow. But the fact remains, our society allows 18 year olds to make a lot of decisions, a lot of very profound decisions that can affect them for the rest of their lives. Eighteen year olds can move out of the family home, they can go become starving actors and actresses in New York City, and we can't stop them. Eighteen year olds can go marry some guy that rides a Harley motorcycle, and we can't stop them. Eighteen year olds can sign contracts, 18 year olds can serve in the military, they can die in Afghanistan, they can have children, they can do all these things. Just about the only thing I can't think of in this society is buy and drink alcohol.

And it may be that society's rule with regard to 18 year olds and tobacco should be changed. Maybe we ought to insure that all tobacco is not sold at

Albertson's and Safeway and Fred Meyer. Maybe it should all be sold at OLCC stores and you can't walk in there unless you are 21 years of age. That might be a good thing, I don't know. But that's for society to decide, for our elected representatives to decide. It's not for us here in this courtroom to decide.

So let's talk about Michelle Schwarz's decision to smoke.

I showed this to you on opening statement, a little simple time line.

January 1964, the Surgeon General's Report was issued and published in every newspaper in the country. Nine months later, Michelle Schwarz went to nursing school. She was a nonsmoker then. Sometime between September and December, she started dating Dr. Schwarz, who was a smoker. The warning came on the packs about a year later.

Why do young people start smoking? You have some -- quite a bit of evidence on that point. If you believe Dr. Pollay, it's all advertising. But what did Dr. Burns say, the physician from California who has worked on the Surgeon General's Report, what did he say? He said: Young people start smoking as a, quote, symbolic act. He didn't say one word about advertising causing young people to smoke.

1 -

Dr. Benowitz, the addiction specialist, what did he say why people start to smoke? Quote: The most important reason is social, friends.

That resonates with our life experiences.

Dr. Resnick, the fellow who was retained about two weeks ago for the first time and testified in this case, said the primary reason is their peers. That's why young people start smoking. It's not the advertising.

Mr. Wobbrock calls Dr. Pollay an impartial expert? Excuse me. Excuse me. Dr. Pollay is a hired expert witness. He's a professional witness. He flies around

the country testifying in tobacco trial after tobacco trial, and he does it -- well, you decide why he does it. Do you think Dr. Pollay is totally objective about the issue of advertising? Do you think he's totally impartial? Do you think he doesn't have any biases here? You don't think he has an ax to grind, to use Mr. Wobbrock's expression.

Looking at his testimony, ladies and gentlemen, I would submit you could easily conclude Dr. Pollay came in here and tried to pull the wool over your eyes a little bit. Okay.

Dr. Pollay tried to mislead you about two points that I would submit you ought to think about in

evaluating whether his testimony makes sense and whether you want to accept it.

First of all, he showed you that grid that Mr. Wobbrock had -- remember that grid with all those colors on it -- and said: Look at this advertising. And he tried to imply how Philip Morris controlled the airways back in the '60s, and how Philip Morris would be able to get everyone to smoke because they ran the airways, right?

Okay, do you remember that? You can barely tell what was red, what was pink, what was orange. And, yes, I asked Mr. Walsh to do his technical maneuvers.

Again, please, Mr. Walsh, just take them all off except the Philip Morris.

Why didn't Mr. Pollay -- excuse me, Dr. Pollay -- bring that in? I mean, at least it would have been honest, ladies and gentlemen. At least he would have been telling you the straight story: Yes, Philip Morris advertised on television.

Well, there it is. They didn't monopolize the airways.

And then another point: Dr. Pollay showed you 45 minutes worth of Benson & Hedge's, the "oh, the disadvantages" ads. Do you remember those? What didn't he tell you? He didn't tell you that those ads

didn't start running until at least 1966, two years after Michelle Schwarz started smoking. Those TV ads had nothing to do with her starting smoking. Why did Dr. Pollay not tell you that? When those ads started running on TV, Michelle Schwarz was 20 years old. She wasn't a kid.

And I would submit Dr. Pollay's omission was not inadvertent, but it was calculated. After all, the man has, what, over 10,000 cigarette ads in his library. He knows when these ads ran. But he didn't tell you the truth.

And let's look at the quality of his opinions. Did what he told you make sense to you? How many ads did Dr. Pollay show you? Look at this, like at that. Remember all those ads he showed you: Football players and baseball players and swimmers.

How many Benson & Hedges ads did he show you; a couple? Other than the TV ads. I'm talking about the ads that Michelle Schwarz would have seen between, let's say, 1960, when she was 14, to 1964, when she as 18 and chose to smoke. How many Benson & Hedges ads did he show you?

Did Dr. Pollay, the advertising expert, show you

24 how those Benson & Hedges ads would appeal to a 14 to 25 18 year old girl; did he dissect those ads and say:

Look at this, look at that, see how that would appeal to a young girl living in Illinois. No. Instead, he spent about one minute or less showing you Benson & Hedges ads. Glossed right over it.

Why did he gloss over them? Because he has nothing to say about these ads. That's why. He can't -- he couldn't think of one thing about these ads that would possibly appeal to a 14 year old girl or an 18 year old young woman. He implied -- he stated Philip Morris targeted youth.

Use your common sense, ladies and gentlemen. Right here, right now, look at those ads. Is that youth advertising? Is that the kind of ads that appeals to kids, 14 year old girls?

You know, we saw one ad in this trial that might appeal to kids, and it was this one: "Make the right move. Think. Don't smoke." Ads that Philip Morris run. I kind of grew up in the '60s, and that ad would -- I could have related to that ad in the '60s. I guess that look is now back.

And there it is.

3

5

6 7

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24 25

> 1 2

3

6 7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2 3

4

5

6

7

If you were marketing to kids, if you were trying to get kids to smoke cigarettes, would you have an ad that would look something like that, with someone holding a cigarette that a young person could relate

to? And those aren't Benson & Hedges ads, those aren't Merit ads.

You can talk about youth targeting, youth marketing, all you want. But the proof, as my Dad used to say, is in the pudding. Look at the ads. Compare those ads to the ads in this case.

Now, in cross-examination, Dr. Pollay backed off a little bit. He said: Yeah, I guess there are other factors involved in smoking besides ads. You do have to look at the information environment. That's true. What's that, Doctor? I had to pull it out of him line by line. He wouldn't give an inch voluntarily. Well, yeah, includes school, what you learn in school; yeah, it includes mass media articles in the newspaper and magazines about the dangers of smoking; yeah, it includes what your parents tell you; it includes what your spouse would tell you, especially if your spouse was a doctor. That would be particularly credible. It does include what your friends might tell you, it does include what the government might tell you with warnings. That's true, he said.

And he acknowledged that countries where there's never been cigarette advertising until very recently, like Russia, communist country for 60 years, no advertising, high rates of smoking.

So do ads cause smoking? Is that the only reason people smoke? Of course not. People don't smoke because of ads, they smoke for other reasons.

And then I asked Dr. Pollay to explain this. advertising takes away our free will, if advertising controls our desires, if we are slaves to advertising, why is it, why is it that in the face of this advertising behemoth that Dr. Pollay described to you, why is it that in the face of that in this country, smoking rates have dropped dramatically and significantly? If advertising was so effective, that wouldn't be the case.

2.

This demonstrates, ladies and gentlemen, that cigarette advertising and marketing does not control people's decisions or people's choices. Advertising and marketing does not erase people's awareness and knowledge and understanding that cigarette smoking is dangerous and can kill you because this represents the millions and millions of Americans who have quit, and the millions and millions of Americans over the last 20 years who have chosen not to smoke in spite of advertising, in spite of marketing.

Mr. Wobbrock says: Oh, all those green charts, you know, that's not evidence. Well, that is evidence. That's fact.

Let's talk a little bit more about evidence, about why Michelle Schwarz, how she related to ads.

Shirley Chuck-Dye testified that Michelle Schwarz never told her that she felt misled by cigarette advertising. Dr. Schwarz testified that cigarette ads had no impact or affect on Michelle Schwarz. Dr. Schwarz testified that Michelle Schwarz never told him, ever, in 33 years of marriage, that she started smoking because of advertising. That's evidence. That's not rhetoric.

I would submit that your common sense, your life experiences in this society, tell you that advertising does not cause people to start smoking any more than the multimedia advertising blitz of Anheuser-Busch caused Michelle Schwarz to drink beer, because she chose not to bring beer, and she was subjected to millions of Budweiser and Coors and every other kind of beer ad -- they're on television -- for 40 years. And they had no affect on her because she didn't want to drink beer.

Michelle Schwarz started smoking for the same reasons a lot of people, including young people, started smoking: Family, both the mother and father smoked the whole time; peers.

We don't know much about Michelle Schwarz's

friends growing up, but we know about one, probably the most important friend she ever had, Dr. Schwarz. Michelle was an 18 year old young woman living away from home for the first time, going to nursing school. She met a third year medical student by the name of Richard Schwarz, the next year he was Dr. Richard Schwarz. He was six years older than she was. I don't know, but I think you can make a fair interpretation of the evidence that it's highly unlikely Michelle Schwarz ever dated a man six years older than she is. She had just graduated from high school. She was probably used to dating high school boys, and all of a sudden she runs into a sophisticated man, a highly educated man, Richard Schwarz. And he was smoker. What does your common sense tell you about the single most important reason why Michelle Schwarz all of a sudden started smoking within a couple of months after meeting Dr. Schwarz and dating him.

What does your life experience tell you about what

was most likely, most important to Michelle Schwarz. She wanted to look grown up, probably. She wanted to demonstrate her independence from her mother and father, who told her that she could not smoke while she lived in the family home.

Compare that impact, ladies and gentlemen, compare 25

what's going on inside the head of an 18 year old young woman dating a six year older medical student, compare that to the wooden ducks and the microscope and the golf balls of the Benson & Hedges ads that were in magazines. What does your common sense tell you is most important and resonating most powerfully with Michelle Schwarz.

Let's talk about youth smoking. I have to address this topic because, like I said, it's a hot button topic.

If you believe Philip Morris affectively advertised and marketed, targeted, planned to get 12 year olds to smoke cigarettes, you might not think about any of the other evidence in this case because I bet that would make you angry, as well it should. But youth smoking, ladies and gentlemen, in this courtroom doesn't have anything to do with Michelle Schwarz because she was not a kid when she began smoking. Our society's rules said it was okay for Philip Morris to market cigarettes and sell cigarettes through its distributors and retailers to 18 year olds. Philip Morris was not breaking the law, nor was Michelle Schwarz breaking the law back in 1964 when she purchased her cigarettes.

But you saw some documents, old documents from

Philip Morris, six or seven or eight -- I didn't count them all -- which do indicate at least someone at Philip Morris, at some time, at some place, was taking a look at statistics -- 90 percent of them dealt with publicly available statistics -- but all the same, was taking a look at statistics involving the smoking patterns of 14 year olds and 15 year olds, and even some 12 year olds.

I asked Nancy Lund to come out here to Portland, Oregon, the most senior advertising and marketing person at Philip Morris -- she is at the top -- to come in here and look you in the eye and tell you about that. And she told you straight up: That was inappropriate. That's offensive. That's not the Philip Morris I know.

Most of those documents are written by Meyer and Johnston, a demographer down in Richmond, the Marketing Department, the advertising departments in New York City. He's not part of the Marketing Department and never was. None of those documents talk about how to craft advertisements that will appeal to 12 year olds. None of those documents talk about developing marketing strategies to increase the share of 14 year olds smoking Marlboro. None of those documents, none of those data, was used in the Marketing Department.

According to Nancy Lund: Those documents did not, do not and never have represented Philip Morris policy.

I would submit there are three basis for you to conclude that. First and foremost, like I said before,

look at the ads themselves. What Philip Morris ad -- and I'm not talking about some other competitor's ads, I'm talking about Philip Morris ads. That's the evidence you are bound by the Court's instructions to consider in this case. What Philip Morris ad -- and you're going to have dozens and dozens of them to look at, and I invite you to look at every one of them. What Philip Morris ad have you seen in this courtroom that would appeal to youth, that's youth targeting, that's youth marketing. You make that call. You don't need a marketing degree, you don't need to be an expert witness, you don't need to have a Ph.D. to make that call. That call comes from you, your common sense, your life experiences.

1 2

Second basis, the reason I think I know that, or I would submit you should find that this was not Philip Morris company or policies of Philip Morris, we've heard again and again and again about the millions and millions of pages of Philip Morris internal documents that have been released. Most of them were released starting in 1994; and as the years went on, more and

more were released. If Philip Morris had a policy, a practice of targeting and marketing to youth, you would have a series of documents in this case that would go to the ceiling. There would be hundreds and hundreds of pages showing internal Philip Morris youth marketing strategies, and there isn't. There's only a handful.

And the third reason is that you have the testimony of Nancy Lund. Nancy Lund told you straight up: I don't want my kid to smoke, I don't want your kid to smoke, I don't want Mr. Wobbrock's kid to smoke. And she looked you in the eye and she told you that.

Your job is to determine credibility of the witnesses. You have to make the assessment whether Nancy Lund came here from New York and lied to you. Nancy Lund said: I have gone through thousands of marketing and advertising documents going way back, and I saw no evidence that any marketing or advertising campaign targeting youth was ever carried out.

Where is the evidence inconsistent with that, other than those handful of documents from the demographer who wasn't even marketing for them.

This case is about knowledge or awareness, the knowledge and awareness of Michelle Schwarz. I believe the evidence has shown that Michelle Schwarz was warned that smoking was dangerous and a hard habit to break,

addictive, dependant, whatever word you want to use; according to Dr. Benowitz, they're synonymous. She knew that. She knew that from her, as Dr. Pollay calls it, her information environment. And I'm here to tell you, her information environment did include cigarette advertising. I can't deny that. I'm sure -- we don't have any direct evidence of it -- but I think we can safely assume she did see cigarette ads when she was growing up and after she started smoking. And it's going to be for you folks to decide whether or not those advertisements would erase an intelligent person's knowledge and understanding that cigarette smoking is dangerous. That's your call to make.

And part of that information environment, as Dr. Pollay said, you have to consider what he called

source credibility. Source credibility. Because not all sources of information are equal. Some are more believable than others.

Where did Michelle Schwarz get her information about smoking?

One source was her mother, Shirley Chuck-Dye, a smoker herself, yes. And Shirley Chuck-Dye came in this courtroom and told you the truth. As Mr. Wobbrock correctly point out, she told you that she loved her daughter very much. She told you about the pain that

she's experienced because of the death of her daughter. And she told you that's not the way it's supposed to be. And she's right. Because a loving mother, she also gave Michelle Schwarz the information that she needed to make some of the difficult decisions in life that we all have to make. And one of them was smoking. Remember, she said: Gee, I read that 1952 Reader's Digest article -- because we subscribed to that magazine the whole time Michelle was growing up -- Reader's Digest article from 1952 called Cancer by the Carton. And, boy, that got my attention. That said right there flat out: Smoking is a cause of lung cancer. Smoking increases your risk of dying.

So what did Shirley Chuck-Dye do? What any mother would do. Sat Michelle down and said: Hey, don't smoke. Here is why. But it wasn't just one time. It wasn't just one article in 1952 when Michelle was an eight years old. Of course not.

The evidence was Reader's Digest was on a campaign against smoking. They had a long series of articles from 1952 all the way through the '60s about the dangers of smoking. And Shirley Chuck-Dye testified that she pointed out to Michelle Schwarz those articles as they appeared. Talked to her about it. Not just once. Talked to her more than once about the health

risks of smoking. In fact, her mother told Michelle that smoking was a nasty habit and about the worse darn thing you could do.

Now, that's good, common sense information that Michelle Schwarz had. I think all of us believe our mother. We don't always follow our mother's advice. Sometimes we think we know better, and we make decisions independent of what our mother told us or our father told us. But whose responsibility is that?

When our 18 year olds do what we don't want tell them to, and you give them the keys to the car and you say: Look it, I don't want any drinking; and if you do drink, do not drive home. Call a cab or get me to come and I'll come pick you up. Sometimes our kids don't listen to us. Whose responsibility is it?

An 18 year old goes out and buys a six pack of Colt 45 malt liquor and gets drunk and injures someone, whose responsibility is that. Or injures themselves? Whose responsibility is that?

We don't know much about what Michelle Schwarz's father told her. We do know that he switched around 1970 from smoking regular cigarettes to Carlton, an ultra low cigarette. And we'll talk a little bit more about that later. Circumstantial evidence might tell you he probably talked to Michelle about why he was

switching to that cigarette. But we do know he told her at some point in time that smoking is dangerous and asked her to quit.

And then we know that she had a teacher, kind of a quirky fellow, but her teacher. High school biology, 1962, 1963, Lincoln Way High School. And he came in here and told you: Michelle Schwarz was in my biology class. I don't remember much about her, except I fined her 25 cents for losing her locker key because I had that written down someplace. But she was in my class.

And we spent a week, when we got to the respiratory system, we spent a week talking about how the lungs work, and we spent a couple days talking about the risks of smoking. And we talked about how smoking -- what it does to the lungs and the bronchi. And we talked about the particulate matter in smoke and how smoking can kill you, how smoke can cause lung cancer.

And I showed my students photographs of lung cancer in the lung. And I had my students look at slides with lung -- with lung tissue, with cancer in it. And they looked at the slides through the microscope and they drew the abnormal cancerous cells as part of their homework. And I handed out American Cancer Society pamphlets.

That was part of Michelle Schwarz's information environment, it was part of the information environment of all of her friends that went to that same high school.

Maybe Michelle Schwarz chose to disregard the information that her teacher had provided for her. Whose responsibility was that? Does that mean Mr. Garrelts is a failure, as Mr. Tauman would have it? A failure? He did his best. Maybe he could have done better. I don't know. But at least he gave his students the basic information.

Defense Exhibit 652, the biology textbook used in her classroom, the textbook that Mr. Garrelts used to lecture his students about. "Recent research indicates a possible link between smoking and lung cancer. The Public Health Service has stated the evidence indicates that excessive smoking is one of the causative factors in lung cancer. Some of the tars formed by the burning tobacco have been found to be carcinogenic agents; that is, capable of producing cancer."

"A smoker actually becomes a slave to two habits, the smoking habit and the tobacco habit. The heavy consumers of tobacco also acquire a physiological craving for tobacco, the tobacco habit."

That's the word they called it in the '60s,

3.4

"habit."

That information was provided to Michelle Schwarz. Maybe she chose not to believe it, maybe she chose to disregard it. But whose responsibility is that?

Next item on the list is the press. I'm not going to -- I'm sure to your relief -- go through the hundreds and hundreds of articles that you'll have in evidence, newspaper and magazine articles from the magazines in the cities where she lived, Chicago in the Joliet area in the '60s, St. Louis area where she went to nursing school from the mid '60s to the mid '70s,

and the Oregon Statesman Journal. Article after article after article after article talking about smoking causes cancer, heart disease and other diseases. Article after article talking about the habit-forming characteristics of the addictive nature of tobacco and how difficult it is to quit.

1 2

The Public Health Community. You heard a little bit about the Surgeon General's Report. You heard a lot about the Surgeon General's Report. It came out — the first one, the most important one, initially came out in 1964. It concludes that smoking was a principle cause of lung cancer. "Smoking leads to a tobacco habit and dependence. Nicotine is a drug or has pharmacological actions, a habit, withdrawal symptoms."

You heard testimony, evidence about how it was a big story. And you'll see that in the newspaper articles that you'll have back in the jury room about how big of a story it was.

That cigarette smoking is habit forming or dependant causing or addictive isn't new. Dr. Benowitz said it's been known for 75 years or more that tobacco was addictive. Dr. Schwarz was a second year medical student when that report came out. Would it be reasonable to assume that a medical student might be very interested in one of the biggest public health stories to come around? Don't you think that that report might have had something to do with his decision just a couple years later to quit smoking?

Nursing school. We know that Michelle was going to nursing school and studying human health.

Dr. Schwarz. She dated a medical student for about a year, when she was 18. When she was 19, 1965, she married the then Dr. Schwarz. Michelle Schwarz had access to a lot more information than even most folks have about the health risks of smoking. Dr. Schwarz quit smoking in 1968 because he knew smoking could cause disease.

Michelle Schwarz was married to a doctor. She had access to all the information and all the privileges

that come with that, and we're going to talk more about that later.

Warning labels. The warning labels started in 1966. You've seen it before. Could it have been stronger? Yeah. Could it have been better? Yeah. But that's what Congress wrote in 1965. Does it give you all the information? No. But doesn't it give you the heart of the matter. Doesn't it tell you that you're running a risk smoking these things? It doesn't go into all the gory details, that's true. But a living, thinking, intelligent person with a product with that label on it would know: This is bad for my health. I'm taking a risk.

That's what that warning label says. That was part of Michelle Schwarz's information environment when she chose to run the risk.

THE COURT: Mr. Dumas, we won't go to another issue. If you want to finish with this issue, we will stop for lunch.

MR. DUMAS: That will be fine, Your Honor. If you just give me two more minutes, I'll wrap up.
THE COURT: All right.

23 MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you. 24 Michelle Schwarz chose to run the risk with just this information. Forget the other labels, forget the 2.5 other information, just that. If she chose to run that risk and ignore it, whose responsibility is that? I don't know exactly how much Michelle Schwarz 3 smoked. The medical records go from half a pack to a 5 full pack, okay. That means ten to 20 cigarettes a 6 day. Ten to 20 times she picks up a pack with that 7 warning on it. Seventy to 140 times a week she has an opportunity to read that warning. 9 And think about this warning in the context of the 10 way it developed. Here in 2002, that didn't mean much. 11 Back in 1965, it was such a big deal that the 12 government was putting a warning label on a product. 13 That was unheard of. Do you remember that one St. 14 Louis -- I mean -- yeah, it was St. Louis Dispatch News 15 article I showed you. They had a photograph of a side 16 of a cigarette pack in 1965 or 1966 saying: Look at 17 this. This is going to start January 1. It was news, the fact that the government was 18 putting warning labels on cigarettes. Because back in 19 20 the '60s, you know, people didn't wear helmets when 21 they went skateboarding -- they probably didn't have 22 skateboarding -- they didn't have helmets when they 23 went bicycle riding, they didn't wear seatbelts in the early '60s, there weren't nutrition labels on food. 24 25 This was unique, it stood out and it was news. And it 1 was written by the US government, and it became the 2 law. 3 One last comment on warning labels, and then we'll break for lunch. 5 Not everyone in 1965 felt that warning labels on cigarettes were necessary. The American Medical 6 7 Association, an organization Dr. Schwarz probably joined, stated in 1964: With respect to cigarettes, 9 cautionary labeling cannot be anticipated to serve the 10 public interest with any particular degree of success. 11 The health hazards of excessive smoking have been well 12 publicized for more than ten years and are common knowledge. Labeling will not alert even the young 13 14 cigarette smoker to any risks of which he is not 15 already aware. 16 That was true for Michelle Schwarz in 1964, 1965 17 and 1966, as it was for millions of other Americans. 18 Thank you, Your Honor. 19 THE COURT: All right. 20 Members of the jury, we'll stop for lunch now. 21 But I need you back in the jury room about 22 12:58 because we are going to start again at 23 one o'clock. 24 Have a nice lunch. 25 (Jury leaves the courtroom at 12:01 p.m.) 39 THE COURT: The Court is out of session. 1 2 The Court needs counsel back in the courtroom at 3 1:00 p.m. 4 MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Your Honor. 5 THE COURT: Let's make that 12:59, for you. 6 (Court was in recess) 7

```
8
 9
               (Estelle Keating reports the next session)
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
                                                             40
    STATE OF OREGON
 1
                             ss.
 3
    County of Multnomah
 5
 6
                          I, Charlotte A. Powers, Official
 7
    Court Reporter of the Circuit Court of the State of
    Oregon, Fourth Judicial District, certify that I
 8
 9
     reported in stenotype the foregoing proceedings in the
10
     above-entitled case.
11
                         I further certify that my
12
     stenotype notes were reduced to transcript form by
13
    Computer-Aided Transcription under my direction.
14
                         And I further certify that pages 2
15
    through 40 contain a full, true, and accurate record
    of my stenotype notes.
16
17
                          Dated this 28th day of August,
18
      2002, at Portland, Oregon.
19
20
21
                       Charlotte A. Powers, RPR, CSR
22
                                 Official Court Reporter
23
     I certify this original/duplicate is valid only if it bears
24
     my true signature and blue colored CSR seal.
25
     Charlotte Powers
```